IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

and
THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT APPEAL No.1855 of 2002

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated 16-7-2000 in W.P.No.11440 of 2002 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

Sree Ramana Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. (TB 246),

Parvathapur, Ghatkesar Mandal, Rangareddy District,

represented by its President K.Malla Reddy

..... APPELLANT

AND

1 Phool Chand Singh, S/o Budh Ram Singh,
R/o Parvathapur Village, Ghatkesar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District
2 The Assistant Director, Survey and Land Records,
Ranga Reddy District at Hyderabad
3 The District Collector, Ranga Reddy District
4 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy District
5 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Ghatkesar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District
6 SEVA TRUST, H.No.3-76, Street No.6,
Habsiguda, Hyderabad rep.by its Chairman, S.V.Pardhasaradhi Rao
(R6 is impleaded as per Court Order dated 26/08/2004 in WAMP 2227/2004)

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Appellant: Mr.P.PRATAP REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr. C.HANUMANTHA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 to 5: GP FOR REVENUE

Counsel for the Respondent No.6: Mr. H. VENUGOPAL

The Court made the following :

ORAL JUDGMENT : (per **B. SUDERSHAN REDDY,J)**

It is unfortunate that an insignificant order passed by the learned single Judge directing the competent authority to dispose of the application said to have been filed by the 1st respondent gave rise to this writ appeal, which, in our considered opinion, is ill-conceived. The learned Judge merely directed the competent authority to take action in accordance with law with reference to the application dated 27-9-1999 filed by the 1st respondent-writ petitioner and to undertake the demarcation of the land in question in accordance with law.

Evidently, this order passed by the learned Judge has no bearing upon any question of title, possession or interest of any of the parties including the appellant herein.

There is any amount of dispute on the question as to whether the actual demarcation of the land had already been taken place or not. Sri Hanumantha Rao, the learned counsel for the 1st respondent-writ petitioner states that pursuant to the direction of this Court, the demarcation had already taken place, while the learned counsel for the appellant states that even while the demarcation work was in progress, the present writ appeal has been filed and interim order has been obtained. That if the demarcation work has already been completed, it shall be open to the appellant herein to apply for the report and the map, if any, prepared by the competent authority, which shall be furnished subject to payment of requisite fee and charges. If the demarcation has not been completed and if there is any further demarcation and survey is required, it can be undertaken only after putting all the parties on notice.

The demarcation itself or fixation of the boundaries would not cause any prejudice to the claim of any of the parties. It is needless to clarify that the order is confined only to the extent of demarcation of the land.

With the clarification as above, the Writ Appeal shall stand dismissed, without any order as to costs.

_____

B.Sudershan Reddy, J

29-3-2005

_____

C.V.Ramulu, J

Prk

DEPUTY REGISTRAR

/True copy/

SECTION OFFICER.

To

1 Phool Chand Singh, S/o Budh Ram Singh,
R/o Parvathapur Village, Ghatkesar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District
2 The Assistant Director, Survey and Land Records,
Ranga Reddy District at Hyderabad
3 The District Collector, Ranga Reddy District
4 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy District
5 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Ghatkesar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District
6 S.V.Pardhasaradhi Rao, Chairman, SEVA TRUST, H.No.3-76, Street No.6,
Habsiguda, Hyderabad.

7 2 CCs to Govt.Pleader for Revenue, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT)

8. 2 CD copies

-

-